

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/727,166	11/30/2000	Harold A. Dvorachek	1709898	2672
7:	590 08/07/2003			
EDWARD L. BROWN, JR.			EXAMINER	
125 N. MARKET ST SUITE 1100			KRECK, JOHN J	
WICHITA, KS	67202		1709898 EXAMI	PAPER NUMBER
			3673	
DATE MAILED: 08/0			DATE MAILED: 08/07/2003	l

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	/1
Advisory Action	09/727,166	DVORACHEK, HAR	DLD A.
Advisory Addion	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John Kreck	3673	YM
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addr	ess †
THE REPLY FILED 15 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application in the same of th	cation. A proper rep	ly to a ation in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The datase been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the shortened by above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most parent patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. So I 36(a) and the appropriate tee. The appropriate extention or (i	ee MPEP extension fee ension fee under 2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause: .		
(a) \( \square\) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (	(see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clain	ıs.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s): See Continuation Sheet	<u>t</u> .	
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed	amendment
<ul> <li>5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ required place the application in condition for allow</li> <li>6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be</li> </ul>	rance because: See Continuation	Sheet.	
raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>54</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>51-53 and 55-60</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 16-19,26-3	<u>30 and 61-64</u> .		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) □ approved or b) □ disap	proved by the Exam	iner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·	
10.⊠ Other: See Continuation Sheet	HEAT	THER SHACKELFORD	
	SUPERVI	SORY PATENT EXAMINIOLOGY CENTER 3600	IER
	- FA	R	

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Applicant's reply overcomes the rejection of claim 54. Claim 54 would be allowable if amended to include all the limitations of claim 51. The proposed amendment to claim 60 overcomes the 112 rejection to claim 60, however claim 60 would still be rejected under 103.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments regarding independent claim 51 are not persuasive. Applicant has argued that the "Mills element 48 is not a drag-bit element". It is noted that the claim language calls for the element to suitable to be mounted on a drag bit. The Mills bit uses elements 64, 66, and 68 as drag cutters (as acknowledged by applicant on page 6, lines 14-16 of the response); thus the Mills bit is a "drag-bit". With regards to applicant's arguments about the tapered portion; it is clear that the tapered part (shown near 46 in figure 1) must contact the formation. Regarding the "engageable structure"; the opposite sides of the Mills device are clearly engageable (by a wrench, for example); how else could it be screwed into the socket?

Continuation of 10. Other: Applicant's proposed amendment simiplifies the issues, and thus would be entered on appeal..